

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

26 January 2009

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Dunn, J. D. G. (2005) 'Q1 as oral tradition.', in The written gospel : festschrift for Graham N. Stanton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 45-69.

Further information on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2277/0521540402>

Publisher's copyright statement:

© Cambridge University Press 2005

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

*Q^I as oral tradition**James D. G. Dunn*

The most influential study of Q in recent years has been that of John Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*.¹ Kloppenborg's analysis of the 'sapiential speeches in Q'² leads him to the conclusion that 'a collection of sapiential speeches and admonitions was the formative element in Q', a collection 'subsequently augmented by the addition and interpolation of apophthegms and prophetic words which pronounced doom over impenitent Israel'.³ This 'formative stratum', which can be conveniently designated Q^I, consists of six 'wisdom speeches', 'united not by the themes typical of the main redaction [Q²], but by paraenetic, hortatory, and instructional concerns'.⁴ The six 'wisdom speeches' he lists as:⁵

- 1 Q 6.20b–23b, 27–35, 36–45, 46–9;
- 2 Q 9.57–60, (61–2); 10.2–11, 16, (23–4?);⁶
- 3 Q 11.2–4, 9–13;
- 4 Q 12.2–7, 11–12;
- 5 Q 12.22b–31, 33–4 (13.18–19, 20–1?);⁷ and probably
- 6 Q 13.24; 14.26–7; 17.33; 14.34–5.

This chapter is dedicated to Graham Stanton, in token of long and much-valued friendship and as a far from adequate expression of deep appreciation for all that his scholarship on the Gospels has contributed to NT studies.

¹ Kloppenborg 1987; see also his masterful *Excavating Q* (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000).

² Kloppenborg 1987, ch. 5. ³ *Ibid.*, 244.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 317; Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:146.

⁵ Kloppenborg 1987, ch. 5, summarized and amended in Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:146. That six collections of aphoristic sayings lie behind Q was already suggested by Zeller 1977:191–2 (Q 6.20–3, 31, 36, 43–6; 10.2–8a, 9–11a, 12, 16(?); 11.2–4; 12.2–3, 8–9, 10; Matt 6.19–21, 25–33; Q 12.35–37(?), 39–40). Piper 1989 identified five aphoristic collections: Q 11.9–13; 12.22–31; 6.37–42; 6.43–5; 12.2–9; to which he added Luke 6.27–36 and 16.9–13.

⁶ Kloppenborg regards 10.23–4 as part of the secondary redaction of Q, along with 10.21–2 (Kloppenborg 1987:201–3), but with some qualification (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:147 n. 63).

⁷ In Kloppenborg 1995, he suggests that Q 13.18–21 (which was not treated in his analysis of Q^I in Kloppenborg 1987:223 n. 214) was perhaps added to Q 12.2–12, 13–14, 16–21, 22–31, 33–4, in the formative layer of Q (311).

Kloppenborg is clear that 'tradition-history is not convertible with literary history', and that his concern is only with the latter; the judgment that material is redactional, secondary, is a *literary* judgment and need not imply anything about the *historical* origin or emergence of the tradition in view.⁸ So he certainly does not wish his analysis necessarily to imply that redactional material from the secondary compositional phase cannot be dominical. And by the same token, it need not follow that material from Q¹ is necessarily the oldest material in the Q tradition. On the other hand, the archaeological imagery of a *lowest* 'stratum', capable of being uncovered by 'excavation', almost unavoidably promotes the implication of an *earliest* stratum, a stratum which contains the earliest artefacts of the literary 'tell' known as Q.

More to the point here, Kloppenborg works essentially with a *literary* model for the history of the Q material. Not only is Q itself, or already Q², a literary document,⁹ but Q¹ is conceptualized in the same way. He never explicitly examines the question, but his talk of Q² 'interpolations' into Q¹ clearly imply an established script into which insertions can be made. And in *Excavating Q* he speaks of Q¹ as 'a good example of instructional literature' and as 'the product of scribes', 'a scribal accomplishment'.¹⁰

It is this assumption, that the earliest grouping of Q material (Q¹) was already a written text, which I wish to question. I have already raised the issue in a much more wide-ranging discussion (Dunn 2003a). And in *Jesus Remembered* I have expressed my doubts as to the character of the Q¹ material in a footnote,¹¹ with some comments on several of the passages designated as Q¹ scattered in a disjointed way through the following pages. What I would like to do in this chapter is to subject the Q¹ material as a complete whole to the same sort of analysis, to see what kind of collection it is and whether there are sufficient grounds for regarding it as a single, coherent collection or scribal composition. My hypothesis is (1) that the Q¹ material consists of groups of teaching material, clusters of wisdom sayings and exhortations, used by teachers in the early Christian communities in their oral teaching role within these communities; (2) that the use made of this material by Matthew and Luke attests the flexible or variable character of the oral tradition used in such teaching – hence the difficulty which the compilers of the Q document have typically experienced in reconstructing the Q text for this material;¹²

⁸ Kloppenborg 1987:244–5. He has continued to make this point in subsequent writing – most recently Kloppenborg 2001.

⁹ For Kloppenborg, Q is simply Q² with the temptation narrative (Q 4.1–13) and a handful of other brief passages inserted (e.g. Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:212–13).

¹⁰ Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:197, 200, 209. ¹¹ Dunn 2003b:157 n. 82.

¹² *The Critical Edition of Q* (Robinson et al. 2000). I will refer to this by the abbreviation *CEQ*.

and (3) that it is very unlikely that the Q' material formed a coherent unit or single collection used as such in the several communities which we can assume to have been familiar with the Q' material.

I will proceed then by examining the six clusters of Q material identified above in sequence.¹³ As in *Jesus Remembered* I will lay out the key Matthew/Luke texts synoptically, along with *Gospel of Thomas* and other parallels where appropriate, and with the parallel (Q?) material indicated simply by underlining. To make the texts more accessible I will use English translation, but attempt to ensure as far as conveniently possible that the English translation and the underlining reflect the vagaries of the Greek.

I THE SERMON ON THE PLAIN – Q 6.20B–23B, 27–49

1.1 Matt. 5.3–6, 11–12/ Luke 6.20–31/ (*Gos. Thom.* 54, 69.2, 68)

Matt. 5.3–6, 11–12	Luke 6.20–23	<i>Gos. Thom.</i> 54, 69.2, 68
3 <u>Blessed are the poor in spirit,</u> for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 4 Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. 5 Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth. 6 <u>Blessed are those who</u> <u>hunger and thirst for righteous-</u> <u>ness, for they will be filled.</u>	20 <u>Blessed are the poor,</u> for yours is the kingdom of God. 21 <u>Blessed are those who</u> <u>hunger</u> now, for you will be filled. Blessed are you who weep now, for you will laugh. 22 <u>Blessed are you when</u> <u>people hate you, and when they</u> <u>exclude you, revile you, and</u> <u>reject your name as evil you on</u> <u>account</u> of the Son of Man. 23 <u>Rejoice</u> in that day and leap for joy, for surely <u>your reward is</u> <u>great in heaven; for that is what</u> <u>their fathers did to the</u> <u>prophets.</u>	54 <u>Blessed are the poor,</u> for yours is the kingdom of heaven. 69.2 <u>Blessed are those who</u> <u>hunger,</u> that the belly of him who desires may be satisfied. 68 <u>Blessed are you when</u> <u>people hate you and persecute</u> <u>you,</u> and no place will be found where you have [not] been persecuted.

In every case to be examined it is obvious that the sort of variation in the texts here presented could be explained by a process of editorial manipulation of a common written source. But it is at least equally possible to infer that each of the three texts has been derived from an oral tradition, or orally preserved memory

¹³ Because of pressures of space I will have to bypass the items in Kloppenborg's list of six groups where he has put a question mark, and also those further passages which he now thinks may also belong to 'the earliest level of Q' – Q 15.4–7, 8–10; 16.(13), 16, 18; 17.1–2, 3–4, 6 (Kloppenborg 1995:314–15; Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:146 n. 62). The additional material does not make any real difference to the picture which emerges below; Luke 15.8–10 has no Matthean parallel.

of Jesus teaching the blessedness of the poor, the hungry and the persecuted.¹⁴ Or to put the point more accurately, given that we are talking about a predominantly oral society as the context for this tradition, each of these texts can be seen as a typical performance of a shared oral tradition. The common features of the three texts are just what one might expect to have remained firm within such a tradition, and the variations between them are better explained as the variations deemed appropriate in performances of the tradition to different communities.¹⁵ On a literary model the variations of Q 6.22–3 are hard to explain as editorial redactions: why such changes?¹⁶ But on an oral model, such variations as part of a ‘live performance’ are what we should expect, without having to find a reason for them beyond the mood of the performative moment.

1.2 Matt. 5.39–47; 7.12/ Luke 6.27–35/ (*Did.* 1.3–5/ P. Oxy. 1224/ *Gos. Thom.* 95, 6.3)

Matt. 5.43–7	Luke 6.27–8, 32–5	<i>Did.</i> 1.3; P. Oxy. 1224; <i>Gos. Thom.</i> 95
<p>43 You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy.’</p> <p>44 But I <u>say to you</u>, <u>Love your enemies</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">and <u>pray for those who persecute you</u>, 45 so that you may be sons of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous. 46 For <u>if you love those who love you</u>, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? 47 And if you greet only your brothers, what more are you doing than others? Do not <u>even the Gentiles do the same?</u></p>	<p>27 But I <u>say to you</u> that listen, <u>Love your enemies</u>, do good to <u>those who hate you</u>, 28 <u>bless those who curse you</u>, <u>pray for those who abuse you</u>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">...</p> <p style="text-align: right;">32 And <u>if you love those who love you</u>, what credit is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them. 33 And if you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? For <u>even sinners do the same</u>. 34 If you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, to receive as much again. 35 But love your enemies, do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return. Your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High; for he is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked.</p>	<p>1.3d Love <u>those who hate you</u>, and you shall have no <u>enemy</u>.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1.3b <u>Bless those who curse you</u> and <u>pray for your enemies</u>, and fast for those who persecute you.</p> <p>P. Oxy. 1224 ... a)nd pray for your [enem]ies.</p> <p><i>Gos. Thom.</i> 95 If you have money do not lend at interest, but give ... from whom you will not get it (back).</p>

¹⁴ Cf. Davies and Allison 1988–97:1.441.

¹⁵ For oral tradition as characteristically a combination of fixity and flexibility, of stability and diversity, of ‘variation within the same’, see Dunn 2003a:154–5.

¹⁶ Kloppenborg concludes that Q 6.23c is Q² redaction (Kloppenborg 1987:190).

Matt. 5.39b–42	Luke 6.29–30	Did. 1.4b, d, 5a
But whoever hits you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also; 40 and to the one who wants to sue you and take your tunic, let him have your cloak also; 41 and whoever forces you to go one mile, go with him a second. 42 Give to the one who asks you, and do not turn away the one who wants to borrow from you.	29 To the one who strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also; and from the one who takes away your cloak do not withhold your tunic also. 30 Give to everyone who asks you; and from the one who takes what is yours, do not ask for it back.	4b If someone gives you a blow on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, and you will be perfect. 4d If someone takes your cloak, give him your tunic also. 5a Give to everyone who asks you, and do not ask for it back.

Matt. 7.12	Luke 6.31	Gos. Thom. 6.3
Everything, therefore, whatever you wish that people should do for you, so also do for them; for this is the law and the prophets.	And as you wish that people should do for you, do for them likewise.	... [and what you ha]te do not do ...

If the tradition used here was typical of Q, or to be more precise, typical of the material common to Matthew and Luke which provides the basis for the whole Q hypothesis, then it is doubtful whether the Q hypothesis would ever have emerged – that is, the hypothesis of Q as a written document known to and used as such by Matthew and Luke. The level of verbal agreement in the first two sections listed above is just too low to support the hypothesis of a literary document underlying both.¹⁷ But equally improbable as an explanation of the character of the agreements and non-agreements of Matthew and Luke is the usual alternative, which dispenses with the Q hypothesis and argues instead that Luke derived his (Q) text by redacting Matthew (or vice versa).¹⁸ Such hypotheses help make sense of some details, such as Matthew's introduction (Matt 5.43). But most of the other variations are inconsequential (e.g. Q 6.29–30),¹⁹ and cause one to wonder why, on a literary hypothesis, the second author should have bothered to change the text of the first.²⁰ Much the more obvious explanation is that both Matthew and Luke knew a tradition about Jesus' teaching on love of enemies, and about generosity of attitude to the hostile and the poor; and that

¹⁷ *The Critical Edition of Q* (CEQ; Robinson et al. 2000:58) has to opt for 'so that you may become sons of your Father, for he raises his sun on bad and [[good and rains on the just and unjust]]' for Q 6.35, drawn exclusively from Matt 5.45.

¹⁸ Most recently Goodacre 2002.

¹⁹ The CEQ version, without the double square brackets which indicate 'reconstructions that are probable but uncertain' (Robinson et al. 2000:lxvii) – 'probable' seems too uncritical in most cases – reads '... you on the cheek, offer [opting for Matthew's *strepson* rather than Luke's *pareche*] ... the other as well; and ... your shirt ... the coat as well' (Robinson et al. 2000:60).

²⁰ On Q 6.31 see Dunn 2003b:566–9.

either both knew the tradition in a form already diversely elaborated in performance and/or transmission,²¹ or they on their own account produced their written text in the manner and with the freedom of an oral performance (in oral mode).

1.3 Matt. 5.48; 7.1-5; 10.24/ Luke 6.36-42/ (Mark 4.24/ John 13.16/ Gos. Thom. 34, 26)

Matt. 5.48; 7.1-5; 10.24	Luke 6.36-42	Mark 4.24; John 13.16; Gos. Thom. 34, 26
<p>5.48 Therefore, be perfect, <u>as your heavenly Father is perfect.</u></p> <p>7.1 <u>Do not judge</u>, so that you may <u>not be judged</u>. 2 For with the judgment you make, you will be judged:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">and with</p> <p><u>the measure you give it will be measured to you.</u></p> <p>10.24 <u>A disciple is not above the teacher</u>, nor <u>a slave over his master</u>. 25 It is enough for the disciple that he be <u>like his teacher</u>.</p> <p>7.3 <u>Why do you see the speck which is in your brother's eye</u>, but the log <u>in your eye you do not notice?</u></p> <p>4 Or how do you say to your brother, 'Let me take out the speck from your eye', while <u>the log is in your own eye?</u> 5 You hypocrite, first take the log out of your eye, and then you will see clearly to take out the speck from your brother's eye.</p>	<p>36 Be merciful, just <u>as your Father is merciful.</u></p> <p>37 <u>Do not judge</u>, and you will <u>not be judged</u>:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">do not condemn, and you will not be condemned. Forgive, and you will be forgiven: 38 give, and it will be given to you. A good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be put into your lap; for by the measure you give it will be measured in return to you. 39 He also told them a parable: 'Can a blind man guide a blind man? Will not both fall into a pit? 40 A disciple is not above the teacher,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">but everyone who is fully qualified will be like his teacher.</p> <p>41 <u>Why do you see the speck which is in your brother's eye</u>, but the log which is <u>in your own eye you do not notice?</u></p> <p>42 Or how can you say to your brother, 'Brother, let me take out the speck in your eye', when you yourself do not see the log in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the log out of your eye, and then you will see clearly to take out the speck which is in your brother's eye.</p>	<p>Mk 4.24 <u>with the measure you give it will be measured to you</u></p> <p>Jh. 34 If a blind man leads a blind man, both of them fall into a pit.</p> <p>Jn 13.16 A slave is not greater than his master.</p> <p>Gos. Thom. 26 <u>The speck which is in your brother's eye, you see, but the log which is in your eye you do not see.</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">When</p> <p><u>you take the log out of your eye, then you will see clearly to take out the speck from your brother's eye.</u></p>

²¹ The parallels in *Did.* 1.3-5 (add in P. Oxy. 1224; also Rom 12.14, 1 Cor 4.12 and 1 Pet 3.9) increase the probability of an oral tradition, unless it is to be argued that 1.4b is drawn from Matthew, whereas the rest is drawn from Luke! See the discussion of the options in Niederwimmer 1993:95-100. See also Betz 1995:8-9: 'This wide distribution of similar but different elements points to oral tradition rather than to a dependency on written texts' (297). *Gos. Thom.*'s two parallels do not help much since they at best reflect traditions recalled with no great concern for any specific detail.

Unlike the first two (sets of) passages, the third gives more signs of literary dependence; the evidence suggests a transmission process more like copying than the inconsequential variations of tradition performed. The above synopsis shows it to be entirely plausible that there was a firm, written Q version (Q 6.37a, 38b–42, with a Marcan doublet at Mark 4.24), which Matthew and Luke have elaborated each in his own way, Matthew adding 7.2 and Luke adding 6.37b–38a (their performance variations). The closeness of verbal parallel in *Gos. Thom.* 26 (also 34) then invites a similar explanation. The synopsis also suggests the possibility, however, that Q 6.40 was known in an oral performance tradition, and/or in the double form of Matt 10.24–5a,²² a possibility strengthened by the repeated emphasis on the latter part of the Matt 10.24b saying in John 13.16 and 15.20.²³

1.4 Matt. 7.16; 12.35/ Luke 6.43–5/ (*Gos. Thom.* 45)

Matt. 7.16; 12.35	Luke 6.43–5	<i>Gos. Thom.</i> 45
<p>7.16 You will know them by their <u>fruits</u>. Are <u>grapes gathered from thorns</u>, or <u>figs</u> <u>from thistles</u>?</p> <p>12.35 The good man out of his good treasure brings <u>good things</u>, and the evil man <u>out of his evil treasure</u> brings <u>evil things</u>.</p>	<p>43 No good tree bears bad fruit, nor again does a bad tree bear good fruit; 44 for each tree is <u>known from its own fruit</u>. <u>Figs</u> are not gathered out of <u>thorns</u>, nor are grapes <u>picked from a bramble bush</u>. 45 The good man out of the good treasure of his heart produces <u>good</u>, and the <u>evil</u> (man) <u>out of evil</u> (treasure) produces <u>evil</u>;</p> <p><u>for it is out of the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaks</u>.</p>	<p>1 <u>Grapes</u> are not gathered from <u>thorns</u>, nor are <u>figs</u> picked from <u>thistles</u>; for they give no fruit. 2 A good man produces <u>good out of his treasure</u>;</p> <p>3 a wicked man produces <u>evil out of his evil treasure</u> which is in his heart, and <u>speaks evil things</u>; 4 for out of the abundance of the heart he brings forth evil things</p>

It is quite feasible to envisage a text of Q something like Luke 6.43–5, and then to propose some substantial Matthean editing (omitting Q 6.43 and 6.45b, and separating 6.44 from 6.45a), with Thomas omitting Q 6.43–4a.²⁴ If we had only the Matthew/Luke parallels to work with, it would be easier to deduce an oral tradition which contained the recollection of two sayings of Jesus to similar effect. Moreover, the variations of grapes/thorns, figs/thistles (Matthew/*Thomas*) and figs/thorns, grapes/

²² The CEQ version of Q 6.40 offers, 'A disciple is not superior to "one's" teacher. [[It is enough for the disciple that he become]] like his teacher' (Robinson et al. 2000:78).

²³ On the character of the interdependence of John on Synoptic-like tradition see Dunn 1991.

²⁴ Thus CEQ (Robinson et al. 2000:84–93).

bramblebush (Luke), as also question (Matthew) or statement (Luke/Thomas), are more characteristic of oral performance than of literary copying.²⁵ But the *Thomas* evidence certainly strengthens the case for an established (written?) sequence consisting at least of Q 6.44b–45 – unless, of course, Thomas knew and used Luke!

1.5 Matt. 7.21, 24–7/ Luke 6.46–9

Matt. 7.21, 24–7	Luke 6.46–9
<p>21 Not everyone who says to me ‘<u>Lord, Lord</u>’, will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who <u>does</u> the will of my Father who is in heaven. . . .</p> <p>24 <u>Everyone</u> then who <u>hears these my words and acts on them</u> will be <u>like</u> a wise man who <u>built his house on rock</u>.</p> <p>25 Torrential rain fell, the <u>floods</u> came, and the winds blew and beat on <u>that house</u>, but it did not fall, for it had been <u>founded on rock</u>.</p> <p>26 And everyone <u>who hears</u> these words of mine and <u>does not act on them</u> will be <u>like</u> a foolish man who <u>built his house on sand</u>.</p> <p>27 Torrential rain fell, and the <u>floods</u> came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it <u>fell</u> – and <u>great</u> was its fall!</p>	<p>46 Why do you call me ‘<u>Lord, Lord</u>’, and do not <u>do</u> what I tell you?</p> <p>47 <u>Everyone</u> who comes to me and <u>hears my words and acts on them</u>, I will show you what he is <u>like</u>. 48 He is like a man <u>building a house</u>, who dug deeply and laid the <u>foundation on rock</u>; when a <u>flood</u> arose, the river burst against <u>that house</u> but could not shake it, because it had been well built.</p> <p>49 But he <u>who hears</u> and <u>does not act</u> is <u>like</u> a man <u>building a house on the ground</u> without a foundation. When the <u>flood</u> burst against it, immediately it <u>fell</u>, and <u>great</u> was the ruin of that house.</p>

In this case the indications point in the opposite direction.²⁶ We are back with a sequence of inconsequential variations: in particular, the ‘wise’/ ‘foolish’ contrast and the contrast of sand with the rock are Matthew’s alone; Luke fills out the story of the building of the house, and Matthew the picture of the elements battering the houses; likewise the different effects of the flood on the two houses look like free variation. These differences do not appear to be derived from an already-fixed text, but rather are just the sort of variations one would expect from story tellers painting a vivid picture for a spell-bound audience.²⁷ Or if we want to say that one or

²⁵ Cf. Davies and Allison 1988–97:1.706: ‘Perhaps we are not dealing with Q but with variants from oral tradition.’ The traditional example of what is contrary to nature (a vine does not bear figs, or an olive grapes) (Kloppenborg 1987:182 n. 52), as in Jas 3.12, is given a sharper twist (thorns, thistles, bramblebush).

²⁶ Morgenthaler 1971 notes that Matthew’s and Luke’s versions show only a 24 per cent verbal agreement.

²⁷ Cf. Betz 1995:559–60. Minor variations taken as evidence that Q was known in different versions (Q^{Mt} and Q^{Lk}) simply illustrate how well established is the literary ‘default-setting’ in modern analyses of the tradition history of such texts; but the facts which lend themselves to the hypothesis of multiple Qs are, in an oral society, more simply interpreted as evidence of a variably performed oral tradition.

other (or both) felt free to depart from an established text in this way, then it comes to much the same thing, for it means that however fixed in writing the tradition already was, the tradition thus written down was actually more fluid, as demonstrated by Matthew's and/or Luke's use of the tradition in oral or performance mode.

To sum up this far: it is likely that the Q material known usually as 'the Sermon on the Plain' (loosely speaking Q 6.20–3, 27–49) was already well established as a familiar and shared collection of material in the teaching resources of many early churches. Whether this was because Jesus was remembered as delivering some of his teaching in some such sequence,²⁸ or because the collection was the work of (an) early teacher(s) or apostle(s) whose grouping of the teaching set the pattern for other teachers,²⁹ it is no longer possible to tell. That some of the material was written down and known in that form is quite possible, though we must always recall that the society was predominantly oral, with only a small minority capable of *reading* any such text.³⁰ And the likelihood of more and more being written down (for convenient transmission) as the Jesus tradition spread ever more widely is strong. But even so, most of the 'Sermon on the Plain' was probably better known in oral form: the grouping could still be regular and firm – a standard repertoire for teachers;³¹ but the variations still evident in the enduring form of most of the tradition bear the marks of a tradition variously performed in various churches, the substance stable, but the detail responding to the circumstances and the mood of the different occasions of celebration, instruction and performance.³²

²⁸ Fitzmyer 1981: 'The similarities are such that they suggest that the tradition has preserved here something from an extended sermon delivered by Jesus toward the beginning of his ministry' (627).

²⁹ I use 'teacher' as shorthand to denote those in the various groups/churches/communities who were recognized by these groups/churches/communities, and perhaps even charged by them to be chiefly responsible for retaining and rehearsing the traditions shared by the groups/churches/communities.

³⁰ See, e.g., Dunn 2003a:148–9.

³¹ 'A repertoire of sayings of Jesus originally spoken in other contexts' (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:156). I cannot help asking whether the characteristics of the 'sermon' which Kloppenborg proceeds to describe as characteristics of Q (156–9) are better described as characteristics of Jesus' teaching preserved by the compilers of these repertoires.

³² Contrast Vaage 1995: 'The composition before us could not reflect an antecedent "oral" work with sufficient stability to be identified as the "sermon", owing to the very nature of orality ... The "sermon" would need to have been written down virtually at the very moment when it was first orally composed in order for the text that we now read in Q to represent the oral composition one might presume to posit' (92–3). This comment betrays the literary mind-set, where oral precedents relate to the Q text as earlier editions of the 'sermon', and fails to appreciate that the Q sermon can be seen as itself a performance of familiar groupings of teaching material.

2 ON DISCIPLESHIP AND MISSION – Q 9.57–62; 10.2–11, 16

2.6 Matt. 8.19–22/ Luke 9.57–62/ (Gos. Thom. 86)

Matt. 8.19–22	Luke 9.57–62	Gos. Thom. 86
<p>19 A scribe then approached and said, 'Teacher, I will follow you wherever you go.' 20 And Jesus says to him, 'Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head.'</p> <p>21 Another of his disciples said to him, 'Lord, first let me go and bury my father.' 22 But Jesus said to him, 'Follow me, and let the dead bury their own dead.'</p>	<p>57 As they were going along the road, someone said to him, 'I will follow you wherever you go.' 58 And Jesus said to him, 'Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head.'</p> <p>59 To another he said, 'Follow me.' But he said, '[Lord], first let me go and bury my father.' 60 But Jesus said to him, 'Let the dead bury their own dead; but as for you, go and proclaim the kingdom of God.'</p> <p>61 Another said, 'I will follow you, Lord; but let me first take leave of those at my home.' 62 Jesus said to him, 'No one who puts a hand to the plough and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God.'</p>	<p>1 [Foxes have] their [holes] and birds have [their] nests, 2 but the son of man has nowhere to lay his head and rest.</p>

It was to be expected that various sayings of Jesus about discipleship, or the call to discipleship, or the cost of discipleship would be located together in a pigeonhole of the memory of the typical teacher in early disciple groups. It was, after all, in response to such challenges that the members of these groups had become disciples. The fact that they are remembered as a cluster of 'discipleship sayings' distinct from the nearest equivalent cluster in Mark 8.34–8 pars., and that the latter are heavily marked by the lead saying on 'taking the cross' (8.34 pars.),³³ suggests that the former cluster (here being considered) reflects more the pre-Easter understanding of discipleship.³⁴ That is to say, the cluster may already have been in place before the events of Jesus' own passion. At all events, the three-fold tradition clearly indicates one or two sayings of Jesus which had bitten

³³ The Matthew/Luke parallels to Mark 8.34–9.1 are best explained as drawn almost entirely from Mark; the sequence is one of the best examples of literary interdependence between the three Synoptics. The Q material includes the parallels to Mark 8.34–8 of Matt 10.38/Luke 14.27, Matt 10.39/Luke 17.33 and Matt 10.33/Luke 12.9, so that there does not seem to have been such a widespread desire to retain them as a cluster, at least in performance. On Matt 10.38–9 par. see below, #6.16–17.

³⁴ The CEQ reconstruction omits Luke/Q 9.61–2.

deeply into the shared memory of one or more disciple groups. At the same time, the different frameworks within which the sayings were presented indicate both the lack of concern to recall any precise context in which the sayings were initially delivered and the freedom of the different tradents to provide their own framework, as presumably was appropriate in the differing variety of circumstances in which the sayings were recalled.

2.7 Matt. 9.37–8; 10.7–16/ Luke 10.2–11/ (Gos. Thom. 73, 39.3, 14.2)

Matt. 9.37–8; 10.7–16	Luke 10.2–11	Gos. Thom. 73, 39.3, 14.2
<p>37 Then he said to his disciples, 'The harvest is plentiful, but the labourers are few; 38 therefore ask the Lord of the harvest to send out labourers into his harvest'. . . .</p> <p>10.16 See, I am sending you out like sheep in the midst of wolves; so be wise as serpents and innocent as doves.</p> <p>9 Take no gold, or silver, or copper in your belts, 10a no bag for your journey, or two tunics, or sandals, or a staff.</p> <p>11 Whatever town or village you enter, find out who in it is worthy, and stay there until you leave. 12 As on entering into the house, greet it. 13 And if the house is worthy, let your peace come upon it; but if it is not worthy, let your peace return to you.</p> <p>10b for the labourer deserves his food.</p> <p>8 Cure the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons. You received without payment; give without payment.</p> <p>7 As you go, proclaim the good news, "The kingdom of heaven has come near".</p> <p>14 If anyone will not welcome you or listen to your words, as you leave that house or town shake off the dust from your feet.</p>	<p>2 He said to them, 'The harvest is plentiful, but the labourers are few; therefore ask the lord of the harvest to send out labourers into his harvest.</p> <p>3 Go on your way. See, I am sending you out like lambs in the midst of wolves.</p> <p>4 Carry no purse, no bag, no sandals; and greet no one on the road.</p> <p>5 Into whatever house you enter, first say, 'Peace to this house!' 6 And if anyone is there who shares in peace, your peace will rest upon him; but if not, it will come back to you. 7 Remain in the same house, eating and drinking whatever they provide, for the labourer deserves his pay. Do not move about from house to house. 8 Whenever you enter a town and its people welcome you, eat what is set before you; 9 cure the sick who are here,</p> <p>and say to them, 'The kingdom of God has come near to you.' 10 But whenever you enter a town and they do not welcome you, go out into its streets and say, 11 'Even the dust of your town that clings to our feet, we wipe off in protest against you. Yet know this: the kingdom of God has come near.'</p>	<p>73 The harvest is plentiful, but the labourers are few; ask the lord to send out labourers into his harvest.</p> <p>39.3 But you, be wise as serpents and innocent as doves.</p> <p>14.2 And if you enter into any land and wander in the countryside, and if they take you in, (then) eat what is set before you.</p> <p>Cure the sick among them.</p>

The tradition history of the mission commissioning of the twelve is particularly complex, since we have to include the further variants of Mark 6.7–13/Matt 10.1, 7–11, 14/Luke 9.1–6. Without attempting to unravel that

complexity,³⁵ it is fairly clear that Matthew and Luke knew a tradition independent of Mark 6.7–13 but overlapping with it. The evidence presented in #2.7 is sufficient to indicate material that was used and reused in a variety of permutations. This is as might be expected in churches and communities of disciples/believers active in promulgating their faith, including the sending out of missionaries/apostles with a specific charge to evangelize. That is to say, the content and order of the material almost certainly reflects the diverse ways in which the tradition of Jesus' commissioning of the twelve was adapted and varied to suit the different circumstances of diverse contexts and situations. At the same time, there are certain recurring elements which could be included at different points as deemed appropriate. And the tightness of the strictures (no bag, no sandals) and the message of the kingdom's imminence (not attested in preaching after Easter) suggest elements given an enduring shape already in the pre-Easter context of Jesus' own mission.³⁶ At all events, the data are best explained as drawn variously from an oral memory of Jesus' own commissioning, as an oral resource from which differing (versions of) commission(s) could be constructed, rather than as a single established written text which the different Evangelists shredded and reconstructed at will.³⁷

2.8 Matt. 10.40/ Luke 10.16 / (John 13.20; Mark 9.37 pars.)

Matt. 10.40	Luke 10.16	John 13.20
<p>He who receives <u>you</u> receives <u>me</u>, and <u>he</u> who receives <u>me</u> receives <u>him</u> who sent <u>me</u>.</p>	<p>He who hears <u>you</u> hears <u>me</u>, and he who rejects <u>you</u> rejects <u>me</u>; but <u>he</u> who rejects <u>me</u> rejects <u>him</u> who sent <u>me</u>.</p>	<p>Truly, truly, I tell you, <u>he</u> who receives one whom I send receives <u>me</u>; and <u>he</u> who receives <u>me</u> receives <u>him</u> who sent <u>me</u>.</p>
Matt. 18.5	Luke 9.48	Mark 9.37
<p>Whoever receives one such <u>child</u> in my name receives <u>me</u>.</p>	<p>Whoever receives this <u>child</u> in my name receives <u>me</u>; and whoever receives <u>me</u> receives <u>him</u> who sent <u>me</u>.</p>	<p>Whoever receives one of such <u>children</u> in my name receives <u>me</u>; and whoever receives <u>me</u> receives not me but <u>him</u> who sent <u>me</u>.</p>

Here is a typical example of a saying where the substance (*die Sache*) is consistent and constant while the wording (*die Sprache*) varies in content and

³⁵ See, e.g., the brief discussions in Fitzmyer 1985:842–3; Davies and Allison 1988–97:II.163–4.

³⁶ On Luke 10.4 and 7 see Dunn 2003b:505 and 601 respectively.

³⁷ The CEQ reconstruction is therefore remarkably bold – not only Q 10.2–3 (including 3a) and 9, but also 10.4 and most of 10.5–8, 10–11a (Robinson et al. 2000:160–79). Contrast Schröter 1997: 'Eine Betrachtung der verschiedenen Versionen, in denen diese Logien begegnen, erbrachte, dass der Überlieferungsprozess in diesen Fällen nicht nach dem Modell literarischer Abhängigkeit, sondern des Weiterfließens des mündlichen Traditionsstromes vorzustellen ist' (211; also 236–7).

detail. This initial impression from the Q material is strengthened by the fact that Mark 9.37 has a different saying to the same effect, apparently followed/copied by Matthew and Luke, giving both Matthew and Luke an effective doublet of the saying. Rather than insisting that the Q material has to be explained in terms of literary dependence, in the same way that the 'child' version of the saying can be explained by literary dependence on Mark, it makes better sense of all the data to recognize something Jesus said, probably more than once, which was recalled in its substance and reused in varying forms in the course of performing and transmitting the Jesus tradition.³⁸

The second block of putative Q' material (##2.6–8) therefore shares the characteristics of the first (##1.1–5), the last two units in particular (##2.7–8) indicating the likelihood of tradition widely and frequently cited and reworked. To conceptualize that reuse and reworking as a sequence of layers of tradition, equivalent to sequential literary editions, each subsequent edition redacting the written text of its predecessor, is hardly realistic in communities where literacy was at a premium. Much the more obvious explanation is that the tradition was known and used orally in various forms and combinations, and that the literary forms which have actually come down to us are actually frozen performances, normatively typical in their combination of stability and flexibility, rather than one or more fixed forms.

3 ON PRAYER – Q 11.2–4, 9–13

3.9 Matt. 6.9–13/ Luke 11.2–4 (*Did.* 8.2)

Matt. 6.9–13 (<i>Did.</i> 8.2)	Luke 11.2–4
<p style="text-align: right;">9 Pray then in this way:</p> <p>Our <u>Father</u> who is in heaven, <u>hallowed be your name.</u> 10 <u>Your kingdom come.</u> Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. 11 <u>Give us today our daily bread.</u> 12 <u>And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.</u> 13 <u>And do not bring us to the time of trial, but rescue us from the evil one.</u></p>	<p>2 He said to them, 'When you pray, say: <u>Father,</u> <u>hallowed be your name.</u> <u>Your kingdom come.</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">3 <u>Give us</u></p> <p>each day our daily bread. 4 <u>And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive everyone indebted to us.</u> <u>And do not bring us to the time of trial.'</u></p>

³⁸ Dodd 1963:343–7: 'Any attempt, I submit, to account for these phenomena [variations] by a theory of literary dependence must be fruitless. The hypothesis that the evangelists drew upon different branches of a common oral tradition, and that the language they employ, within a form or pattern which remains largely constant, was in large measure determined by variations in that tradition, appears to me the hypothesis which best explains the facts' (347); see further Dunn 2003b:558.

These are the earliest forms of the Lord's Prayer known to us. There is nothing to suggest that the individual petitions of the prayer were known as having been used by Jesus separately, or that the prayer was the composition of some unknown disciple.³⁹ It is remembered only as a prayer taught by Jesus. On the 'default setting' of a literary mind-set the tendency is to think in terms, as usual, of literary dependency – of Matthew and Luke both having access to an established written text (Q), or, a minority would argue, of Luke copying from Matthew and thus producing his own version. But in either case one has to work hard to find reasons why either (or both) made the changes to the text which we find here. The case for transmission by copying is much clearer in *Didache's* evident use of Matthew. But in the case of the Matthew/Luke parallel much the more obvious solution is that these were the forms of the prayer which were being used in the churches of Matthew and Luke respectively. In other words, the two forms exemplify a living liturgical tradition.⁴⁰ As still today, where among English-speaking churches there are three or four slightly different versions of the Lord's Prayer in use, so already in the earliest years of Christianity we can justifiably infer that regular congregational use of the prayer produced the variations which we see in Q 11.4 and the elaborations evident in Matthew's text.⁴¹ This is not to deny that the Lord's Prayer may have been written down at an early stage. It is simply to observe that derivation of the prayer by Matthew and/or Luke from a written source is not the most obvious explanation for the character of the Matthean/Lucan versions.⁴² The congregations served by Matthew and Luke almost certainly knew the prayer because they prayed it regularly, not because they read it, or because someone read it to them from a written document, Q or whatever.

³⁹ The two alternatives suggested respectively by Funk and Hoover 1993:148–50, and Crossan 1991:294. Crossan's assumption that a prayer taught by Jesus would have been more uniform in content (294) takes no account of the character of oral tradition, as well enough attested in the variations of the Synoptic tradition.

⁴⁰ See further Dunn 2003b:227–8, with bibliography.

⁴¹ The trend continues with the subsequent but still very early addition of the final doxology (see again Dunn 2003b:228 and n. 232).

⁴² Cf. Betz 1995:370: 'It is characteristic of liturgical material in general that textual fixation occurs at a later stage in the transmission of these texts, while in the oral stage variability within limits is the rule. These characteristics also apply to the Lord's Prayer. The three recensions, therefore, represent variations of the prayer in the oral tradition . . . (T)here was never only *one original written* Lord's Prayer.'

3.10 Matt. 7.7–11/ Luke 11.9–13/ (Gos. Thom. 92, 94, 2)

Matt. 7.7–11	Luke 11.9–13	Gos. Thom. 92, 94, 2
<p>7 Ask, and it will be given you; seek, and you will find; knock, and the door will be opened for you. 8 For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who seeks finds, and for everyone who knocks, the door will be opened. 9 Or what person among you who, if his son asks for bread, will give him a stone? 10 Or if he asks for a fish, will give him a snake?</p> <p>11 If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father who is in heaven give good things to those who ask him.</p>	<p>9 So I say to you, Ask, and it will be given you; seek, and you will find; knock, and the door will be opened for you. 10 For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who seeks finds, and for everyone who knocks, the door will be opened. 11 What father among you who, if your son asks for a fish, will give a snake instead of a fish? 12 Or if the child asks for an egg, will give a scorpion? 13 If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him!</p>	<p>92 Seek and you will find. But those things about which you asked me during those days, I did not tell you on that day. Now I am willing to tell them, and you do not inquire about them.</p> <p>94 He who seeks will find ... it will be opened.</p> <p>2 He who seeks must not stop seeking until he finds; and when he finds, he will be bewildered; and if he is bewildered, he will marvel, and will be king over the All. (Similar in P. Oxy. 654.1 = Gos. Heb. in Clement, Strom. 2.9.45)</p>

In this case one can readily envisage a written text copied quite faithfully for most of Q 11.9–11, 13, but with slight editorial redaction (addition or omission) in 11.11–12, and the interesting modification ('good things'/'Holy Spirit') in 11.13.⁴³ On the other hand, the variation in the illustration of a son asking of his father (bread/stone, fish/snake, egg/scorpion) is just the sort of elaboration which can be expected in oral performance, as the teacher/preacher presses home the point by multiplying examples. So, even assuming dependence on a written Q, here at least we could speak quite justifiably of both Matthew and Luke reusing the Q tradition in oral mode. The material can then count in part at least as a good illustration of the way tradition, including tradition already in writing, would be used in an oral society.

Given the amount of teaching Jesus presumably gave on prayer,⁴⁴ the slimness of the Q¹ collection (#3) is somewhat surprising. The evidence suggests, however, that no single collection of that teaching became dominant, or rather that his teaching on prayer (and example of

⁴³ Of course, the sayings of Q 11.9–10 and 13 could be sufficiently memorable to have retained a very stable form in oral performance and transmission. But Thomas indicates that only the 'seek and you will find' saying retained such stability over the years, though John 16.23–4 looks like an elaboration of the 'ask and it will be given you' saying (cf. Dodd 1963:351–2). For the debate whether Q 11.9–10 and 11–13 were two originally independent traditions see Kloppenborg 1987:204 n. 140.

⁴⁴ E.g. Mark 9.29; 11.24–5 par.; 14.32–42 pars.; Matt 5.44/Luke 6.28; Matt 6.5–7; Luke 5.33; 18.1–8, 10–14; 22.32.

prayer) was too pervasive in his mission and the resulting Jesus tradition to be restricted to specific collections and that his teaching (and example) served rather as a stimulus to further reflection (and practice).

4 ENCOURAGEMENT TO FEARLESS CONFESSION – Q 12.2–7, 11–12

4.11 Matt. 10.26–31/ Luke 12.2–7/ (*Gos. Thom.* 5, 6.5–6, 33.1)

Matt. 10.26–31	Luke 12.2–7	<i>Gos. Thom.</i> 5, 6.5–6, 33.1
<p>26 So have no fear of them; for <u>nothing is covered that will not be uncovered, and nothing secret that will not become known.</u> 27 What I say to you <u>in the dark, say in the light; and what you hear into the ear,</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">28 Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul;</p> <p>rather <u>fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell.</u></p> <p>29 <u>Are not two sparrows sold for a penny?</u> Yet not one of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father. 30 And <u>even the hairs of your head are all counted.</u> 31 So do not be afraid: <u>you are of more value than many sparrows.</u></p>	<p>2 <u>Nothing is covered up that will not be uncovered, and nothing secret that will not become known.</u> 3 Therefore whatever <u>in the dark you have said in the light</u> will be heard, <u>and what you have said to the ear</u> behind closed doors will be <u>proclaimed upon the housetops.</u></p> <p>4 I tell you, my friends, <u>do not fear those who kill the body,</u> and after that can do nothing more. 5 But I will warn you whom to fear: <u>fear him who, after he has killed, has authority to cast into hell.</u> Yes, I tell you, fear him.</p> <p>6 <u>Are not five sparrows sold for two pennies?</u> Yet not one of them is forgotten before God. 7 But <u>even the hairs of your head have all been counted.</u> Do not be afraid; <u>you are of more value than many sparrows.</u></p>	<p>5 Know what is before your face, and what is hidden from you will be revealed to you; for there is <u>nothing hidden that will not become manifest.</u></p> <p>6.5–6 For there is <u>nothing hidden that will not become manifest,</u> and there is nothing covered that shall remain without being revealed.</p> <p>33.1 What you shall hear <u>into the ear proclaim</u> into the other ear <u>upon the housetops.</u></p>

The grouping here consists of three distinct units – Q 12.2–3, 4–5 and 6–7. The first (12.2) has parallels in Mark 4.22 and a doublet in Luke 8.17 (presumably following Mark), as well as the two *Thomas* versions (*Gos. Thom.* 5.2 and 6.5). To this have been added to form the Q cluster the second and third units (Q 12.4–5 and 6–7), which do not appear to be recalled anywhere else.⁴⁵ An interesting variation, however, is that the first unit (Q 12.2–3) has also been appended to a different saying about revelation, by both Mark and Luke (Mark 4.21/Luke 8.16). At this point the interest quickens further, since the same saying is also preserved elsewhere in Q material (Matt 5.15/Luke 11.33), as well as in *Gos. Thom.* 33.2.

⁴⁵ Some more detail is provided in Dunn 2003b:496–7, 552 n. 47.

Matt. 5.15	Mark 4.21	Luke 8.16	Luke 11.33	Gos. Thom. 33.2
Nor do they ignite a lamp and put it under a bushel, but on a lampstand, and it gives light to all in the house.	Is a lamp brought in to be put under a bushel, or under a bed? Is it not to be put on a lampstand?	No one lights a lamp and hides it under a jar, or puts it under a bed, but puts it on a lampstand, that those who enter may see the light.	No one lights a lamp and puts it in a hidden place or under a bushel, but on a lampstand, that those who enter may see the radiance.	No one lights a lamp and puts it under a bushel, or in a hidden place, but puts it on a lampstand that all who enter and leave may see its light.

So we have a fascinating sequence of permutations, where the same or similar material (Q 12.2/Mark 4.22/Luke 8.17) has been linked one way (#4.11 above), in another way with a different revelation saying (Mark 4.21/Luke 8.16) and known in two versions (also Matt 5.15/Luke 11.33), with *Thomas* providing a further variation by linking the other variations together in *Gos. Thom.* 33 (33.1/Q 12.3; 33.2/Mark 4.21/Q 11.33).

All this indicates a motif in the remembered teaching of Jesus which provided stimulating teaching material for many of the early Christian communities, with the result that it has come down to us in multiplied and varied forms. The variations are hardly to be explained on a hypothesis of Matthew and Luke knowing such tradition in only two written documents (Q and Mark), as though tradition to be transmitted had to be written, and as written formed the only two streams of tradition of the material available. By far the more obvious explanation is that the tradition of the sayings was much used and reused, reflected on and discussed in the various disciple and early Christian groupings.⁴⁶ This is not finished tradition, already shaped into final canonical form. It is living tradition. In these passages the twenty-first-century reader is able to overhear the varied forms of the tradition as they were rehearsed and mulled over in the earliest Christian assemblies.

4.12 Matt. 10.19–20/ Luke 12.11–12/ (Mark 13.11; John 14.26)

Matt. 10.19–20	Luke 12.11–12	Mark 13.11	John 14.26
19 When they hand you over, do not worry how or what you will speak; for it will be given to you in that hour what you will speak; 20 for it is not you who are speaking, but the Spirit of your Father speaking in you.	11 When they bring you before the synagogues, the rulers, and the authorities, do not worry how you will defend yourselves or what you are to say; 12 for the Holy Spirit will teach you in the same hour what you ought to say.	And when they take you, handing you over, do not worry what you will speak, but whatever is given to you in that hour speak; for it is not you who are speaking, but the Holy Spirit.	But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you.

⁴⁶ Cf. Schröter 1997:369.

Jesus here is remembered as encouraging his disciples with the promise of inspiration in the hour of persecution (cf. Luke 21.12–15). A curiosity is the decision of most Q specialists to include the passage in Q.⁴⁷ For on normal reckoning of literary dependence and redactional modification, Matthew is more obviously explained as drawn directly from *Mark*. Consequently the basic agreement between Matthew and Luke (independent of Mark) on which the whole Q hypothesis is predicated ceases to exist; the indications that Matthew knew a second (Q) version of the saying are wholly lacking. None the less, the variations, including John, could be adequately explained on an oral hypothesis: Luke is demonstrating the kind of variation and elaboration which one might find in a particular performance of a familiar saying (whether known in written or only in oral forms); whereas in John the saying has been given a different direction to become the core or basis of a major strand of the extended discourses in John 14–16.

This fourth group of sayings (##4.11–12) hardly seems to form any kind of coherent unit. Quite why #4.12 should be separated from #5.13, which follows, or indeed why Q 12.6–7 has been held apart from Q 12.22–31, is not at all clear. Is it simply that some hortatory repertoires had linked sayings with slightly different purposes and the links were retained through the various transitions of the Q (and larger) tradition? In any case, the material in these sections evidently allowed a fair variety of ordering, probably typical of the permutations and combinations of many different teaching occasions rather than evidence of a careful composition.

5 THE RIGHT PRIORITIES – Q 12.22–31, 33–4

5.13 Matt. 6.25–33/ Luke 12.22–31/ (P. Oxy. 655/ *Gos. Thom.* 36)

Matt. 6.25–33	Luke 12.22–31	P. Oxy. 655/ <i>Gos. Thom.</i> 36
25 Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or what you will drink, or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing?	22 Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat, or about your body, what you will wear. 23 For life is more than food, and the body more than clothing.	Jesus said: Do not worry from morning to evening and from evening to morning what you will eat or about your robe, what you will wear.
26 Look at the birds of the air; they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not of more value than they? 27 And can any of you by worrying add a single hour to your span of life?	24 Consider the ravens: they neither sow nor reap, they have neither storehouse nor barn, and yet God feeds them. Of how much more value are you than the birds! 25 And can any of you by worrying add a single hour to your span of life? 26 If then you	You are much better than the

⁴⁷ Kloppenborg 1988:126; CEQ reconstructs the text on the basis of Luke's version – 'When they bring you before synagogues, do not be anxious about how or what you are to say; for [[the Holy Spirit will teach]] you in that . . . hour what you are to say.'

<p>28 And why do you worry about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they neither toil nor spin, 29 yet I tell you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not clothed like one of these. 30 But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which is alive today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will he not much more clothe you, you of little faith? 31 Therefore do not worry, saying, 'What will we eat?' or 'What will we drink?' or 'What will we wear?' 32 For it is the nations that strive for all these things; and indeed your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. 33 But seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.</p>	<p>are not able to do so small a thing as that, why do you worry about the rest? 27 Consider the lilies, how (they grow): they neither spin nor weave; yet I tell you, even Solomon in all his glory was not clothed like one of these. 28 But if God so clothes the grass in the field, which is alive today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, how much more will he clothe you, you of little faith! 29 And do not keep striving for what you are to eat and what you are to drink, and do not keep worrying. 30 For it is the nations of the world that strive for all these things, and your Father knows that you need them. 31 Instead, seek his kingdom, and these things will be given to you as well.</p>	<p><u>lilies</u> which do not <u>card</u> or <u>spin</u>.</p> <p>And having one clothing ... you ...</p> <p>Who might <u>add</u> to your <u>span</u> of life? He will give you your <u>clothing</u>.</p>
---	--	--

This is one of the better examples of the strength of the case for a written Q, a judgment which I have no wish to dispute.⁴⁸ Even so, the variations between Matthew and Luke are of no great weight,⁴⁹ apart from the final verse of each, and smack more of performance variation than of careful editing. It is possible that the tradition recalls a sustained sequence of teaching given by Jesus on one or more occasions and held in that shape in the tradition that was gathered by Q.⁵⁰ Alternatively, more disparate tradition was put into its present shape by Q or earlier, presumably to provide some teaching resource for church teachers.⁵¹ This tradition continued to be known in oral form and in different sequence (P. Oxy. 655/*Gos. Thom.* 36, paralleling Q 12.22, 27, 25).⁵²

5.14 Matt. 6.19–21/ Luke 12.33–4/ (*Gos. Thom.* 76.3)

Matt. 6.19–21	Luke 12.33–4	<i>Gos. Thom.</i> 76.3
<p>19 Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust consume and where thieves break in and steal; 20 but store up for yourselves <u>treasures in heaven</u>, where neither moth nor rust consumes and where thieves do not break in and steal. 21 <u>For where your treasure is, there will be also your heart.</u></p>	<p>33 Sell your possessions, and give alms. Make purses for yourselves that do not wear out, <u>an unfailing treasure in the heavens</u>, where no thief comes near and no moth destroys. 34 <u>For where your treasure is, there also your heart will be.</u></p>	<p>You also must seek for his <u>treasure</u> which does not perish, which abides where no <u>moth</u> comes near to eat and (where) no worm destroys.</p>

⁴⁸ Other examples in Dunn 2003b:147 n. 29.

⁴⁹ Matt 6.31 sounds like the product of a more vigorous performance than Luke 12.29.

⁵⁰ In an oral community the transition from original teaching to well-formed and stable tradition would not require it to be written down, either to retain the impact of the original teaching or to ensure that the stability was retained in transmission.

⁵¹ For the more common debate see Kloppenborg 1987:216–18.

⁵² Cf. Betz 1995:466–8. For the debate as to whether P. Oxy. 655 or Q 12.22–31 is the earlier, see bibliography in Dunn 2003b:552 n. 45.

Here is a case, somewhat like #1.5 above, where some teaching has been preserved by Matthew and Luke attached to a proverbial saying of Jesus (Matt 6.21/Luke 12.34).⁵³ As is typically the case with such proverbs or epigrams, it has a stable form. The teaching which precedes the proverb has a common theme elaborated, and once again with the sort of variant illustrative detail which could be expected in a live performance (Matthew's 'rust', Luke's 'purses'). It is entirely possible that Jesus' teaching, perhaps on more than one occasion (why not?), provided the theme and the climactic proverb (cf. Mark 10.21 pars. – 'treasure in heaven').⁵⁴ The theme is retained (without the proverb) in *Gos. Thom.* 76.3, and Jas 5.2–3 reads like a further variant on the same theme.⁵⁵ Such variation has the character of an oral tradition played out with variations in the course of many performances more than of literary editing where the climactic punch-line has been dropped as a deliberate editorial decision.⁵⁶

In this case (#5) one can readily see that two such themes of personal counselling might be grouped into a composite unit.

6 THE CHALLENGE OF DISCIPLESHIP – Q 13.24; 14.26–7;
17.33; 14.34–5

6.15 Matt. 7.13/ Luke 13.24

Matt. 7.13–14	Luke 13.24
<p>13 Enter through the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the road is easy that leads to destruction, and there are <u>many</u> who <u>enter</u> through it. 14 For the gate is narrow and the road is hard that leads to life, and there are few who find it.</p>	<p>24 Strive to <u>enter through the narrow door</u>; for <u>many</u>, I tell you, will try to <u>enter</u> and will not be able.</p>

Once again we encounter a saying in which it is hard to envisage the thought processes behind a literary derivation. Why would Luke omit the bulk of a longer written text (= Matt 7.13–14)? Or why should Matthew

⁵³ The fact that there are partial parallels in contemporary Jewish exhortation (see Kloppenborg 1987:221–2 nn. 206–8) may only mean that Jesus was remembered as putting his own stamp on such a familiar theme.

⁵⁴ See further Dunn 2003b:521 n. 158.

⁵⁵ The discussion by Hartin 1991:179–81, assumes an 'original wording' of Q, that is, a tradition known only in a single fixed (written) form.

⁵⁶ Contrast the typical discussion of sources by Fitzmyer 1985:981, where the 'sources' assume a literary fixedness.

elaborate so extensively a shorter written text (= Q 13.24)?⁵⁷ The more obvious explanation is that a saying of Jesus about the challenge and difficulty of entering upon the way of discipleship, using the memorable imagery of a narrow entrance, has been variously formulated and used in different versions in the various congregations which cherished Jesus' teaching and reflected often on the traditions of that teaching. Matthew('s community) was familiar with one version, Luke('s) with the other. An identifiable Q version (= Luke 13.24) is quite possible, but an unnecessary hypothesis. And if Matthew did know a Q 13.24, he handled it with the liberty of a seasoned raconteur, free to elaborate as the dynamic of rapport with a live audience prompted.

6.16 Matt. 10.37–8/ Luke 14.26–7/ (*Gos. Thom.* 55, 101)

Matt. 10.37–8	Luke 14.26–7	<i>Gos. Thom.</i> 55	<i>Gos. Thom.</i> 101
37 He who loves <u>father</u> or <u>mother</u> more than me is not worthy of me; and he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. 38 And he who	26 If anyone comes to me and does <u>not hate</u> <u>his father and</u> <u>mother</u> , wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and even life itself, he <u>cannot be</u> <u>my disciple</u> . 27 <u>Whoever</u>	Jesus said: Whoever will <u>not hate</u> <u>his father and his mother</u> will <u>not be able to be</u> <u>my disciple</u> ; and <u>whoever</u> will not hate his brothers and his sisters and will not <u>carry his cross</u> as I have, will <u>not be</u> <u>worthy of me</u> .	Jesus said: Whoever will <u>not hate</u> <u>his fa[ther] and his mother</u> as (I do), will <u>not be able to be</u> <u>my d[isciple]</u> . And <u>whoever</u> will [not] love his [father and] his mother as I do, will not be able to be my d[isciple], for [my mother] ...
does <u>not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me</u> .	does <u>not carry his own cross and come after me</u> cannot be my disciple.		

That Jesus was remembered as posing the challenge of discipleship in extreme terms (the disciple must 'hate his father and mother') is almost universally accepted.⁵⁸ Matthew's editorial hand is most evident in the softening of the saying's offensiveness ('love' less, rather than 'hate'), and in the insertion of the motif 'is not worthy of me' in verses 37 and 38.⁵⁹ On the hypothesis that the only forms of tradition available and known to Thomas were written, we would have to conclude that Thomas knew both Luke, or Luke's version of Q (not only the word 'hate', but also talk of 'carrying' his cross), and Matthew as well (Matthew's distinctive 'not worthy of me', possibly also the confused talk of 'loving father and mother' in *Gos. Thom.* 101.2). But it is more plausible that two sayings of Jesus, about the disciple hating his parents and about the disciple having to carry his cross,

⁵⁷ Davies and Allison 1988–97 (1:694) attribute 7.13–14 to M, Q^{Mt}, or Q + heavy redaction.

⁵⁸ Bibliography in Dunn 2003b:592 n. 217.

⁵⁹ *Axios* ('worthy') is a thematic term for Matthew in this chapter; note also Matt 10.10–13.

circulated orally in the early churches in various permutations, of which the four versions above are probably a fair sample.

6.17 Matt. 10.39/ Luke 17.33/ (John 12.25)

Matt. 10.39	Luke 17.33	John 12.25
He who finds <u>his life</u> will <u>lose it</u> , and he who <u>loses</u> his life for my sake will find <u>it</u> .	Whoever seeks to make <u>his life</u> secure will <u>lose it</u> , and whoever <u>loses</u> (it) will preserve <u>it</u> .	He who loves <u>his life</u> <u>loses it</u> , and he who hates his life in this world will keep <u>it</u> for life eternal.

The theme of discipleship and its cost evidently featured regularly in Jesus' teaching as it was recalled in disciple communities. We have already noted the collection of sayings in #2.6 above and Mark 8.34–8 pars. Now we add Q 17.33 as well as Q 14.26–7 (#6.16). Notable is the evidence of diverse selection and grouping from a larger resource of such sayings: in Matthew the last two/ three sayings are put together (Matt 10.37–9), whereas in Luke they are quite separate (Luke 14.26–7; 17.33); and the #6.17 saying has quite a close parallel in Mark 8.35 pars. ('Whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake . . . will save it'). In addition, John 12.25 indicates a wider knowledge of a saying of Jesus posing the same essential challenge (he who cherishes his life will lose it), once again indicating a Synoptic-like saying of Jesus used as a springboard for John's own reflections.⁶⁰ To explain all this in terms of literary derivation from one or two texts (Mark and Q) requires ingenuity of explanation for the variations in setting and inconsequential detail. It is much simpler to infer a flexible repertoire of teaching on discipleship⁶¹ known to most teachers in the early churches and taught in various combinations and forms as occasion permitted, to which variety and flexibility the present state of the tradition bears ready witness.⁶²

6.18 Matt. 5.13/ Luke 14.34–5/ (Mark 9.49–50)

Matt. 5.13	Luke 14.34–5	Mark 9.49–50
13 You are the salt of the earth; but if <u>the salt has become tasteless</u> , by what will it be restored? It is no longer good for anything, but is <u>thrown out</u> to be trampled under foot.	34 So <u>salt is good</u> ; but if even <u>the salt has become tasteless</u> , by what can it be <u>seasoned</u> ? 35 It is fit neither for the earth nor for the manure heap; they <u>throw it out</u> .	49 For everyone will be salted with fire. 50 <u>Salt is good</u> ; but if <u>the salt has become without content</u> , by what will you <u>season it</u> ? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with one another.

⁶⁰ See n. 23 above.

⁶¹ The range of the repertoire could be easily extended; see, e.g., the material discussed in Dunn 2003b:425–6, 503–5.

⁶² So Dodd 1963:338–43: 'The least difficult hypothesis to account for the likenesses and differences . . . is that this very fundamental saying had a place in many separate branches of oral tradition' (343).

The saying has the same character as we have already noted in ##1.2, 1.5, 2.8, 5.14 and 6.15. A tightly worded proverb has retained its essential point across the enduring strands of tradition, though the corollary has not been deemed so important as to be retained in fixed form. This suggests a proverb referred back to Jesus, but its corollary formulated and elaborated as individual teachers deemed appropriate.

In #6 as a group one can see some sort of link in terms of the challenges and responsibilities of discipleship. But to suppose that these four units formed a single group in Q' seems rather far-fetched, given the diverse locations of the material in Matthew and Luke. The middle two items (##6.16–17) would much more naturally have been linked with other groups, as in Mark 8.34–8 pars. That they formed part of a much wider repertoire of many early Christian apostles and teachers I have already suggested, and that is probably how the four units should be seen, not as a single cluster but as one permutation of elements from the larger resources of the widely known oral Jesus tradition.

To conclude: Kloppenborg suggests that the material reviewed above forms a coherent group and, in all likelihood, 'a discrete redactional stratum' = Q', 'the formative stratum' of Q. He offers two principal reasons for this conclusion. (1) 'These clusters share a common rhetoric – the rhetoric of persuasion, rather than that of prophetic pronouncement or declamation', in contrast to the rhetoric of defence or attack that characterizes the rhetorical strategy of the main redaction (Q²). (2) The subcollections display 'a common structure, beginning with programmatic sayings (6.20b–23; 9.57–60; 11.2–4; 12.2–3; 13.24), continuing with second person imperatives, and concluding with a saying that underscores the importance of the instructions (6.47–49; 10.16, 23–24; 12.33–34; 14.34–35)'.⁶³

As regards the first argument (1), 'the rhetoric of persuasion' is a very broad and indiscriminating category. It applies to a wide range of the teaching material in the Jesus tradition; indeed, it can embrace most of the material grouped by Matthew in his several collections (Matt 5–7, 10, 13, 18). What becomes clear from Kloppenborg's reasoning is that the decisive consideration for him is not the presence of rhetoric common to the Q' material, but the *absence* of the warnings of coming judgment,

⁶³ Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:144–5. It is not clear how the further material suggested by Kloppenborg for inclusion in Q' (nn. 7, 13 above) fits in with this analysis.

which he judges, not unfairly, to be evidence of Q² redaction (particularly Q 6.23c; 10.12, 13–15; 12.8–10).⁶⁴ But even on the hypothesis of Q as a written document, that hardly constitutes evidence of more than that the compiler of Q used the theme of coming judgment as a means of linking disparate teaching material which he may have been ordering into a whole for the first time. It is equally possible, on the Q hypothesis, that the compiler selected material and versions, or gave his own ‘performance’ of well-known material and themes in the oral Jesus tradition, drawing the material from a wider pool available in a variety of measures in the various churches known to him. It does not follow that the Q material shorn of its polemical and threatening elements⁶⁵ formed an already coherently organized single block of material, let alone that it was known in a single written form.⁶⁶

The argument of a common structure (2) is rather tendentious. To describe ##1.1, 2.6, 3.9, 4.11, 6.15 as ‘programmatically sayings’ is a substantial overstatement (#5 apparently lacks such a saying). Almost any of the sayings in any of the sections could have been placed first and been designated ‘programmatically’.⁶⁷ Likewise Kloppenborg’s observation that the clusters conclude ‘with a saying that underscores the importance of the instructions’ (but ##3 and 4 apparently lack such a saying) is more in the eye of the beholder than in the text: the explanation works well with #1,⁶⁸ but in ##5 and 6, different sayings could have served that function.⁶⁹ The reality is that the groups for the most part are simply that, groups of sayings on a similar theme; and the two in #4 don’t seem to form a particularly coherent unit anyway.

⁶⁴ Kloppenborg 1987:242–3; similarly, Q 13.25–7, 28–30, 34–5 and 14.16–24 are omitted from the #6 material because of its ‘polemical thrust’ (Kloppenborg 1987:235–7).

⁶⁵ Did teachers never utter threats and warnings to outsiders mixed with their exhortations to their communities? Kloppenborg’s neat distinction between a tone which is ‘hortatory and instructional’ and one which is ‘polemical and threatening’, or between proverbs and wisdom sayings ‘to reinforce ethical imperatives’ and those ‘to undergird the pronouncements of judgment’ (Kloppenborg 1987:238–9) evokes more the clinical dissection of an anatomy class than the rhetoric of a fervent teacher.

⁶⁶ Tuckett 1996: ‘It is not clear why the Q¹ layer should be considered as a unity at all . . . it is a big step to jump from earlier (possibly disparate) material to a unified collection of sapiential speeches in a Q¹’ (71; see further 71–4). The disagreements with Zeller and Piper (n. 5 above) also give cause for hesitation. Zeller 1992 gives a negative answer to his question (‘Eine weisheitliche Grundschrift in der Logienquelle?’); see also those cited in Dunn 2003b:156 n. 80.

⁶⁷ Piper 1989 notes that each of his collections, which cut across Kloppenborg’s, ‘begins with a rather general aphoristic saying’ ‘usually followed by a general maxim in statement form which provides ostensible support for whatever is being encouraged’ (61).

⁶⁸ Kloppenborg 1987:185–7.

⁶⁹ Note again Piper 1989:63 in regard to *his* collections: ‘The final unit of the aphoristic collections always provides the key for interpreting the meaning.’

In short, then, the case for designating the material reviewed above as a discrete compositional unit or stratum is weak. Just as unconvincing is the hypothesis that this material was the formative stratum of Q, that compositional techniques can so readily be distinguished from redactional techniques.⁷⁰ Much the more likely hypothesis is that this material, both in the variation of individual content and detail and in the diversity of groupings of the individual units, reflects the pattern of oral tradition. That is, the material as we still have it reflects the flexibility of oral performance, of teachers drawing upon resources of Jesus tradition, much at least of it shared with other churches and teachers, and reteaching it with variant details and emphases which reflect their own idiosyncrasies, the vagaries of live performance and the needs of particular congregations. In a word, the so-called Q¹ material is best understood as oral tradition.

⁷⁰ See further Dunn 2003b:155–7, with bibliography.